



CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

AGENDA

DATE/TIME: Monday, March 21, 2005 7:00 p.m.

**LOCATION: Police Department Auditorium
870 Santa Barbara Drive**

Roll Call

1. Minutes of February 28, 2005 (*draft minutes attached*)
2. Election of Vice Chair
3. Presentation by Transportation and Development Services Manager Rich Edmonston on traffic studies, impacts and mitigations.
4. Subcommittee Report on the South Coast Shipyard NOP (*draft report attached*)
5. Report from Membership Subcommittee
6. Report from EQAC Representative to GPUC
7. Report from EQAC Members on GPAC
8. Economic Development Committee (EDC) Representative's Report
9. Council Member Reports
10. Report from Staff on Current Projects
11. Public Comments
12. Future Agenda Items
13. Adjournment

NEXT MEETING DATE: April 18, 2005

*Attachments can be found on the City's website <http://www.city.newport-beach.ca.us>. Once there, click on **City Council**, then scroll to and click on **Agendas and Minutes** then scroll to and click on **Environmental Quality Affairs**. If attachment is not on the web page, it is also available in the City of Newport Beach Planning Department, 3300 Newport Boulevard, Building C, 2nd Floor.



CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

DRAFT Minutes 2-28-05

Minutes of the Environmental Quality Affairs Citizens Advisory Committee held at the City of Newport Beach Police Department Auditorium, 870 Santa Barbara Drive, on February 28, 2005.

Members Present

Cris Trapp, Acting Chairperson
Steven Rosansky, Council Member
Richard Nichols, Council Member
Mike Browning
Barry Allen
Laura Dietz
Merritt Van Sant
Barbara Thibault

Carol Hoffman
Phillip Lugar
Dolores Otting
Jeannette Thomas
Ray Halowski
Sandra Haskell
Jennifer Winn
Walter Lazicki

Staff Present

Sharon Wood, Assistant City Manager

Guests Present

Jack Wu

Members not present

Brent Cooper - Excused
Kenneth Drellishak - Excused
Matt Wiley - Excused

Kristine Adams - Excused
Christopher Welsh - Excused
Tom Hyans – Sick leave

Chairperson Trapp called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm

1. Minutes of January 10, 2004

Motion: Ray Halowski to approve minutes with addition of “EQAC comments on the”
in reference to the DEIR

Seconded: Phillip Lugar

Motion passes unanimously

2. Discussion of procedures for review of environmental documents

Chairperson Trapp led discussion on EQAC’s role and procedures for review:

- Role is to review environmental documents, not comment on project
- For projects outside the City, comment only on impacts to the City
- Important for all members to participate on subcommittees
- Subcommittee chair is responsible for collecting/organizing comments
- All subcommittee members must read introduction and executive summary, as well as assigned sections

3. Membership Subcommittee Report

Dolores Otting reported that the subcommittee is recommending that Jack Wu and Marianne Zippi be appointed

Motion: Carol Hoffman to recommend appointments of Jack Wu and Marianne Zippi to the City Council for consideration

Seconded: Ray Halowski

Motion passes unanimously

4. Report from EQAC Representative to GPUC

Sharon Wood and Chairperson Trapp reported on the meeting of January 10, 2005.

5. Report from EQAC Members on GPAC

Chairperson Trapp and Jeannette Thomas reported that there was no meeting.

6. Economic Development Committee (EDC) Representative's Report

Chairperson Trapp reported on the meeting of February 16, 2005.

7. Council Member Reports

Council Member Nichols reported on storm water damage and studies of Buck Gully and Morning Canyon. He also reported on the Committee to simplify the City's Zoning Code.

8. Report from staff on current projects

Ms. Wood reported on the following:

- South Coast Shipyard
- Hoag Hospital
- Brookfield Homes

9. Public Comment – None.

10. Future Agenda Items

Rich Edmonston to provide a presentation at the March meeting

11. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

March 21, 2005

PROJECT TRAFFIC STUDIES

The City performs three types of traffic studies depending upon the project to be analyzed: Traffic Phasing Ordinance, Cumulative, and General Plan. The differences and similarities are discussed below.

Traffic Phasing Ordinance (TPO) Studies

These studies are done per the TPO which was originally adopted in 1978. The Ordinance includes a methodology specifying how the studies are to be conducted. The TPO includes a list of fifty-four (54) Primary Intersections that are subject to analysis. Project impact is measured one year after project completion and other projects that have had a TPO analysis, but are not yet fully occupied, are considered as "committed" projects and their traffic is included in the analysis.

TPO studies are required for projects anticipated to generate 300 or more daily trips. The initial impact screening is to determine if project traffic exceeds 1% on any approach leg to a Primary Intersection of the existing traffic plus traffic from committed projects. If project traffic is less than 1%, the analysis for that intersection is complete. For intersections where project traffic is forecast to be greater than 1% an Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) calculation is performed. The results of these calculations are presented as decimal fractions. Significant impact is defined as when project traffic causes the ICU to either go over 0.90, or if the ICU before the project traffic is added is already over 0.90, when the ICU increases by 0.01 or greater, even if that increase is the result of rounding the ICU from the three-decimal place calculation down to two decimal places for final evaluation.

Significant impacts require either a mitigation measure or the project can be approved by a five-sevenths vote of the City Council. Mitigations typically require the addition of a traffic lane for turning or through traffic. Normally adding a lane will provide much more capacity than the project will need and therefore the TPO specifies a formula for determining the projects pro-rata share of the costs for the improvement. The remainder of the funding must come from other developers or the Fair Share fee.

Cumulative Traffic Studies

Few cities were doing any type of project-specific traffic studies when the TPO was adopted in 1978. For many years the City utilized the TPO to satisfy the traffic impact requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Several years ago it was realized that the focus of the TPO was so narrow that it was no longer meeting the criteria of CEQA and Cumulative Traffic Studies were required of any project requiring environmental analysis. A Cumulative study is generally prepared as a companion to a

TPO study and includes traffic from reasonably foreseeable projects in addition to committed project trips. A project is considered to be reasonably foreseeable when a completed project application has been submitted to the Planning Department. Reasonably foreseeable projects in adjacent cities are also included in Cumulative Traffic Studies.

Cumulative Traffic Studies also can include analysis of intersections that are not on the list of Primary Intersections. These are typically intersections where one of the streets is not an arterial street. These studies also may include detailed analysis of onsite circulation along with queueing studies both onsite and in close proximity to project driveways.

Generally the same 1% criterion is applied to identify intersections that will be impacted by project traffic. Since there is greater uncertainty about whether reasonably foreseeable projects will be approved or not, the ICU threshold for Cumulative Traffic Studies is slightly greater. Project impact at an intersection must result in an ICU increase of 0.01 due solely to project traffic and not decimal rounding.

To date the City has not evaluated a project that had a significant impact in a Cumulative Study, but such a finding would result in an mitigation fee that would be determined using the equation contained in the TPO.

General Plan Traffic Studies

These studies are performed in conjunction with a General Plan Amendment. The primary tool for these studies is the Newport Beach Transportation Model (NBTM) which calculates project impacts to both daily traffic volumes on the arterial highway system as well as morning and afternoon intersection ICU values. Manual assignments are used instead of the model when project traffic generation is below about 1500 vehicles per day due to the sensitivity of the model.

Significant impacts identified as a result of a proposed General Plan Amendment have often been addressed through the use of a Development Agreement. Such agreements often call for early implementation of roadway improvements as a public benefit.

A General Plan Traffic Study may have accompanying TPO and Cumulative studies if the project is expected to have one or more phases completed within a five year timeframe. If the project is not anticipated to be built in that time frame, the other studies will be performed at a later date.

MEMORANDUM

To: Environmental Quality Affairs Citizens Advisory Committee (EQAC)
City of Newport Beach ("City")

From: Bridgeport Mixed Use Project (formerly South Coast Shipyard) Subcommittee;
EQAC
City of Newport Beach

Subject: **Notice of Intent to Prepare Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Bridgeport Mixed Used Project**

Date: March 15, 2005

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Intent to Prepare Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Bridgeport Mixed Used Project, which is located at 3300 Newport Boulevard, Newport Beach, California 92658 (formerly known as the South Coast Shipyard & Design Center).

INTRODUCTION – VII. ALTERNATIVES TO BE ANALYZED

We ask that a Residential Development Alternative with increased public access be included in the draft EIR.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST ANALYSIS

I. AESTHETICS

a) The NOP states that there will be multistory buildings, but does not state how many stories. It appears that some will be 2 stories and others will be 3 (or 4) stories as per pages EL-01 through EL-04, although this appears confusing. Please clarify the building heights and analyze the view impacts.

b) **Substantial damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings and historic buildings with a state scenic highway should be changed from Less Than Significant Impact to Potentially Significant Impact.** Clarify the heights of the proposed buildings so that the impacts on views of the bay are understood and mitigated.

IV BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

As the project site is located near a potentially severe hazardous site, especially the Rhine Channel, any building or moving of walls may disturb this site and cause major problems in the Bay. A study is currently underway to determine the extent and severity of this problem. Great care will need to be taken in removing these substances. Also, significant mitigation will be needed to offset any damage.

VI GEOLOGY & SOILS

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil should change from Less Than Significant Impact to Potentially Significant Impact. This project will require grading, excavation and demolition activities which all have major impact on the topsoil.

VII HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment should change from Less Than Significant Impact to Potential Significant Impact. Moving potentially dangerous and hazardous material in the Bay is difficult and such materials could accidentally be dumped into the Bay. A recovery and mitigation plan needs to be provided and analyzed to determine if the Project could help clean the hazardous site through its mitigation efforts.

VIII. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

c) Substantially alter existing drainage pattern of the site of area should change for Less Than Significant Impact to Potentially significant Impact. The amount of traffic both from cars and people and their usage pattern will be changed. These changes should be thoroughly analyzed

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality is listed as Potentially Significant Impact and refers to Section C above. If this is the rationale for such an impact, then all three sections (c, d and e) should all carry the same rating of Potentially Significant Impact.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

a) References the incorporation of public access to the Bay into the project but the exhibits do not make clear where the public access is located, nor does it provide the dimensions of said access. Please provide such details in the EIR.

XIV RECREATION

a) The impact on existing and regional parks should be evaluated in more detail in the EIR and described in a manner to show that there are no adverse impacts. Parkland, boating access, parking for visitors, all will be diminished by this project.

b) References the adequacy of on-site recreation amenities such as the marina and rental sport-fishing opportunities, but does not reference that the code requires payment of in-lieu park fees which will be required for the residential portion of the project. Please detail in the EIR.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

1. The EIR needs to quantify the amount of indoor and outdoor restaurant uses. Restaurants generate a greater traffic and parking demand than general retail. Therefore, if restaurant uses are not considered for the site, the EIR will underestimate the actual environmental impacts of the project.
2. The trash enclosure located near the intersection of 22nd and Arcade Street appears to conflict with the loading area for the neighboring restaurant. If this conflict is not corrected, trash haulers may need to park in the egress lane for the underground parking lot.
3. Will the water inlet and Bridge impact the traffic since they will be an attraction for the public? Will this area be open to the Public, and is there any City Liability regarding the water inlet & bridge? Is the bridge for pedestrians, cars, or both? What will be visible from the street? Is there any landscape planned? How wide is the View Corridor / Entry Courtyard? How, many Exits & Entrances are there? Where is the underground parking entrance and exit?
4. What other circulation problems should be analyzed and mitigated?

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Emergency access on the site appears to be adequate. However, the merging of Balboa and Newport Blvd.S. and 30th streets needs to be discussed further to explain the off site effects of emergency, Fire and Police, and other vehicles in the event of such an emergency.